

Appl. No. 10/004,904
Atty. Docket No. 8798L
Amdt. dated January 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 29, 2005
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Response to Restriction Requirement

Applicant has been required, under 35 USC 121, to elect either Invention I, Claims 1-47, drawn to a method for subject matter [controlling conference room devices] wherein a user has access to and control, via a Graphical User Interface, of data processing systems or components at a location removed from the user, classified in group 715, subclass 740, or Invention II, Claims 48-57, drawn to two-way video and voice communication, classified in class 348, subclass 14.01. Applicant elects with traverse the Invention of Group I, for a method for controlling conference room devices. The non-elected species remaining in the Application are to be held in abeyance until final disposition of the species. Claims 1-47 are drawn to a method for controlling conference room devices elected by the Applicant.

Traversal of Restriction Requirement

Applicant respectfully traverses the Restriction Requirement and submits that the claims of Group I and Group II designated by the Examiner are closely interrelated from a patentability assessment standpoint. In addition, Applicant maintains that the claims of Groups I and II have not actually acquired a separate status in the art, notwithstanding different art classifications which may be artificially assigned for mere cataloging purposes. Therefore, in order to preserve the unity of the invention, both groups should be prosecuted in the same application. Prosecuting Groups I and II together would eliminate duplication of search efforts, thereby simplifying Patent Office examination work. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the requirement to elect either the method for controlling conference room devices comprising, or the system for remotely accessing conference room devices for prosecution on the merits.

Page 11 of 12

Appl. No. 10/004,904
Atty. Docket No. 8798L
Amdt. dated January 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 29, 2005
Customer No. 27752

Without a sufficient showing of independence, or relatedness with proper showing
of distinctness, the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By 
Signature

Erich D. Hemm
Typed or Printed Name
Registration No. 47,286
(513) 634-8960

Date: January 27, 2006
Customer No. 27752